

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 224 785

SP 021 536

AUTHOR Fuller, Janet
TITLE Practical Management Concerns regarding the Use of Health-Related, Motor and Skill Tests to Achieve Sex-Fair Ability Groupings.
SPONS AGENCY Illinois State Board of Education, Springfield.
PUB DATE 15 Jul 81
NOTE 17p.; Paper presented at the Physical Education Ability Grouping and Performance Evaluation Symposium (Ottawa, IL, August 13-14, 1981). For related document, see ED 222 490.
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Ability Grouping; Ability Identification; Athletics; Coeducation; Performance Tests; Physical Activity Level; *Physical Education; Physical Fitness; *Program Implementation; Psychomotor Skills; Secondary Education; *Sex Fairness; Teaching Methods; *Test Interpretation

ABSTRACT

There are many advantages and disadvantages of ability tests for sex-fairness. Several types of assessment criteria for sex-fair ability grouping could be used in fitness-related activities in the curriculum. Health-related physical fitness tests, designed to measure an individual's health fitness and provide for individual improvement, are not conducive to sex-fair ability grouping. However, health-related fitness test results are appropriate for conditioning-type activities. Skill/activity testing methods for sex-fair ability grouping would be effective in some activities, such as swimming and gymnastics, but not in softball or football. Motor ability testing appears to be the best method for general placement of students in sex-fair ability groups in most activities. Skill/activity and motor ability test results are suitable for sex-fair ability grouping in team and individual/dual sports. Few results of any of the three types of tests are applicable to sex-fair ability grouping in rhythms/dance and recreational activities. Ability grouping methods appropriate to programs in the large high school, the small junior or senior high school, and a flexible, modular-scheduled school differ because of the number of students, diversity of student abilities, number of physical education courses and electives, and time schedules. Techniques recommended for sex-fair coeducational classes would involve: (1) efforts to improve girls' skill and fitness levels; (2) review of physical education goals and objectives; (3) sex-fair curriculum and instruction; (4) balance of males and females in coeducational classes; (5) nondiscriminatory behaviors and attitudes; (6) use of several ability grouping methods; (7) structured learning experiences; (8) safe learning conditions; (9) fair game play; and (10) individualized instruction. (Author/JD)

ED224785

PRACTICAL MANAGEMENT CONCERNS REGARDING THE USE OF
HEALTH - RELATED, MOTOR AND SKILL TESTS
TO ACHIEVE SEX-FAIR ABILITY GROUPINGS

Jane: Fuller
Glenbrook South High School
Glenview, Illinois

July 15, 1981

This paper was prepared under contract with the Illinois State Board of Education for presentation at the Physical Education Ability Grouping and Performance Evaluation Symposium. Opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the State Board, and no official endorsement should be inferred.

The reader is referred to: Tips and Techniques: Ability Grouping and Performance Evaluation in Physical Education. Illinois State Board of Education, Springfield, Illinois. 1982.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

C. Reisinger

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

* Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official NIE
position or policy.

SP 021 536

Abstract

Since the passage of Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, junior and senior high schools have had difficulty implementing the law in coeducational physical education programs that demonstrate sex-fairness in student learning. The Title IX Regulation provides for sex-fair ability grouping, but few schools utilize such methods. The purpose of this study is to analyze, from a practical management point of view in junior and senior high school physical education programs, three methods of ability grouping; namely, health-related fitness, skill/activity testing, and motor ability testing.

The writer approaches the problem with the following position. While Title IX was created in spirit to give girls and women more opportunity in education programs, special efforts should be made in ability grouping in physical education to assist girls in improving their skills and performance. For this to occur, ability grouping may not always be equal or sex-fair.

In discussing the advantages and disadvantages of ability tests for sex-fairness, the following were noted. Health-related physical fitness tests are not conducive to ability grouping students in the program of activities. The tests were designed to measure an individual's health fitness and provide individual improvement. Criteria for sex-fair ability grouping could be used in fitness related activities in the curriculum. Skill/activity testing for sex-fair ability grouping would be effective in some activities, but not in others, for example, effective in swimming and gymnastics, but not in softball or football. Motor ability testing appears to be the best method for general placement of students in sex-fair ability groups in most activities in the program.

Skill/activity and motor ability test results are suitable for sex-fair ability grouping in team and individual/dual sports. Health-related fitness test results are appropriate for conditioning-type activities. Few results of any of the three tests are applicable to sex-fair ability grouping in rhythms/dance and recreational activities.

In a large traditional high school physical education program, several practical management methods of providing sex-fair ability groupings in the program are possible. A small traditional high school would need to offer fewer program activities, but sex-fair ability grouping is possible. A flexible modular scheduled high school offers many alternatives to sex-fair ability grouping since the program is designed to meet the needs and interests of students.

In conclusion, the writer recommends a variety of methods be used for sex-fair ability grouping in the physical education program. She urges departments to reevaluate the goals and objectives of physical education and their programs, and to implement sex-equitable and fair instructional methods. Teaching appropriate attitudes and behaviors and utilizing individualized instruction are recommended.

I. INTRODUCTION

Since the advent of Title IX in 1972, traditional physical education programs at the junior and senior high school levels have been challenged. Compliance has been difficult when attempting to satisfy the needs of both boys and girls, men and women staff members, and instructional and program goals. The Title IX Regulation for physical education as in other curriculums requires, "No person in the United States shall, on the basis of sex, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any education program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance ..."¹. This is the spirit of the law. It was intended to give equal opportunity to the disadvantaged students, namely girls.

In physical education, special provisions were made regarding total coeducational programs. During competition in contact sports; namely, wrestling, boxing, ice hockey, basketball, football and rugby, students can be separated on the basis of sex. But during all instructional phases in all activities coeducation must occur.² Ability grouping is permitted providing the composition of the groups is determined objectively with regard to individual performance, not on the basis of sex. Standards for assessing skill or progress must not have an adverse effect on one sex.³

To change traditional boy/girl programs to coeducational programs was simple for some but difficult for most. In observing programs and discussing coeducational programs and instruction with professionals around the State of Illinois and elsewhere, the following was noted. Many physical education programs are more recreational now than before Title IX. Where total coeducational classes exist, many girls and lower ability boys are not receiving adequate instruction in basic skills to improve their own performance.

Several schools are not providing coeducational programs for all students, but instead offer three program choices; namely, all-girl, all-boy, and coeducational classes. Some instructors use organized individualized instruction in a few classes. Few schools utilize ability grouping throughout their program as a means of effectively implementing Title IX.

Some basic questions need to be answered by the secondary school physical educators. Programs need to be reevaluated. The intent of Title IX was not to change the goals and objectives of physical education. What are these goals? Are they still attainable in our present programs? In ability grouping students, what determines sex-fairness? What is practical, yet still fair, to both sexes? After skill testing, is an advanced softball class made up of seventy-five percent boys and twenty-five percent girls fairly grouped, or a lower ability grouped class of seventy-five percent girls, twenty-five percent boys fairly grouped? Do you allow a majority of girls in the lower ability classes in many activities until they gain more experience and skill? Will ability grouping, as in the previous question, continue to place girls in an inferior position? Do you ability group as sex fairly as possible in some activities, but require equal numbers of boys and girls in other classes? Could ability grouping by fitness, skill and motor ability criteria still create a dangerous situation in sports, such as, soccer or speedball, when in a high ability group a large boy collides with a small girl while both are playing the ball?

It is clear from the Title IX Regulation that all instruction is to be coeducational and if ability grouping is to be used it may not be at the disadvantage of one sex. From observations made and the literature reviewed, the writer of this paper takes the following position regarding sex-fair ability grouping. Secondary schools were given three years to fully comply with the law. The adjustment period for full implementation was given, "...because of the existence of wide skill differentials attributable to the traditionally lower levels of training available to girls in many schools."⁴ The writer feels the training level for girls in most physical education programs has not improved greatly since the compliance date of July, 1978. Therefore, many ability grouping methods suggested in this paper will be to improve the competence of the disadvantaged, which are mostly girls. The writer feels this is presently necessary in coeducational curriculums, especially at the secondary level.

II. ADVANTAGES AND DISADVANTAGES OF TESTS USED FOR SEX-FAIR ABILITY GROUPING

A. Health-Related Fitness Tests

Health-related fitness tests such as the recently published AAHPERD testing program are generally not designed for ability grouping students. In reviewing the test manual and the Pate/Corbin article in JOPHER the health-related fitness test was designed to measure individual health fitness.⁵ Students scoring below the fiftieth percentile in cardiorespiratory function, body composition, and abdominal and low back-hamstring musculoskeletal function, should individually be programmed to personally improve his/her lifelong fitness needs.

One of the objectives of physical education is the improvement and maintenance of health-related physical fitness levels. During activities designed to improve physical fitness, ability grouping of students by scores on the AAHPERD test would be appropriate. But to be sex-fair, boys and girls should be assigned by percentiles that are equal as opposed to individual test scores. Since each individual in these fitness activities is attempting to achieve a certain percentile for him or herself, groups could be formed as follows: High Fitness Group - boys and girls scoring in the 75th percentile or above on all three items striving upward to the 100th percentile; Middle Fitness Group - boys and girls scoring in the 50th percentile or above on all three items striving to achieve the 75th percentile; Low Fitness Group - boys and girls scoring in the 25th percentile or above on all three items striving to achieve the 50th percentile; Remedial Fitness Group - boys and girls scoring below the 25th percentile on all three items attempting to achieve the 25th percentile or above.

Health-related physical fitness test results, if used as a criteria for sex-fair ability grouping of students during activities such as volleyball, would have little application. For volleyball, motor ability fitness components are needed such as power, agility, coordination and reaction time. The health-related fitness components would assist performance but they are not as relevant in determining success as a volleyball player.

It is the opinion of the writer that the health-related fitness tests be used as criteria for ability grouping (equal percentiles of boys and girls on all three or individual test items) only in fitness-related activities of the curriculum.

B. Skill/Activity Tests

The skill tests or activity tests are widely used in physical education where ability grouping is operative. These tests are utilized in individual sport activities and have been effective, especially in single-sex classes. In coeducational classes, skill testing for ability groups may provide sex equity in some activities but not in others; for example, pre-test in swimming for stroke efficiency and cardiovascular endurance would result in sex-fair groupings but a pre-test in softball would most likely produce groupings with a majority of boys in the upper skilled ability classes and a majority of girls in the lower skilled ability classes. True sex-fairness would not occur. In the latter situation it is the opinion of the writer that even though sex-fairness does not occur in the softball ability groups, this arrangement is necessary if ability grouping is utilized. Until more girls gain more experience and improve performance in softball skills they should not be placed with more experienced boys. When students are ability grouped by activities, students in each group have a better chance of learning and achieving in a safe environment. Daughtrey writes that a 1967 American Medical Association Committee report states the following reasons for classification of students according to ability,

- "1. To safeguard the health of participants. Adequate protective measures are necessary for safe and enjoyable participation.
2. To group pupils for effective learning. Some degree of homogeneity within a group is essential to optimum learning.
3. To equalize competitive conditions. Reasonable matching of players is a requisite for safe and equitable competition.
4. To facilitate progress and achievement. Similar levels of skill among students are helpful to satisfying performance."⁶

These reasons are particularly important to coeducational classes where the curriculum emphasis is sport activity oriented.

The skill/activity ability grouping is especially good in large classes or classes where many students are scheduled at the same time. For example, if 75 students are scheduled at the same time in an activity, three ability groups of 25 each could form beginning, intermediate and advanced sections of the same activity.

Ability grouping by skill level may cause some students social and self-concept difficulties. Students placed in low ability groups for a long period of time may develop a feeling of inferiority when comparing themselves to their peers. If a greater percentage of girls is continually in the lower ability levels and a concerted effort to improve their skill level is not made, the program would be in violation of Title IX. Attempts should be made in pre-testing skill abilities to select criteria that do not disadvantage one sex over the other.

An operational disadvantage to skill testing for ability grouping is, if carried out for many activities, testing and placement of students is time consuming. If activity units are not long enough, students fail to achieve improved performance and find it difficult to advance to the intermediate and advanced levels. Programs conducted predominantly by skill/activity ability grouping fail to meet other objectives of physical education such as health-related fitness and social interaction among peers.

C. Motor Ability Testing

Total physical fitness consists of health-related fitness components (cardiovascular endurance, muscular endurance, strength and flexibility) and motor ability components. Corbin, in discussing motor ability components, says "Power, speed, agility, coordination, balance, and reaction time contribute to one's ability to perform skills and to participate in enjoyable leisure time activities."⁷ Tests often used for determining general motor abilities are the Scott Motor Ability Test for girls and the Barrow Motor Ability Test for boys. Establishing average scores for each student on all test items, then grouping students, both boys and girls, by ranges of scores, is a reliable method of sex-fair ability grouping. Corbin breaks down each sport and other activities and rates each on its own value for motor ability components.⁸ By so doing, student scores for general motor abilities can be good predictors of success in each of the activities Corbin lists. The writer feels for most programs that are sport/activity oriented, grouping students by motor ability is the best method for achieving sex-fairness. By the use of these tests, students could be grouped by abilities for an entire school year and appropriately grouped in most activities. Test results of each component of motor ability could be used as criteria for grouping students in specific sport/activity units; for example, gymnastics requires balance, coordination, agility and power. Students who scored high in these areas could become the advanced class. Those who scored low on the above items might be placed in the beginning or low ability level.

Curriculums that utilize only motor ability tests for classification of students in the program would need to add health-related fitness activities. A program of only sport-related activities fails to meet the total fitness requirement of each student.

III. APPLICATION OF ABILITY GROUPING

METHODS WITHIN INSTRUCTIONAL UNITS

For the purpose of this paper analysis of each sport is not appropriate. Attempts will be made to suggest methods applicable to several activities with examples given. Whenever possible, activities are classified by team sports, individual/dual sports, conditioning activities, rhythm/dance activities or leisure time activities.

A. Team Sports

Successful play in such team sports as basketball, soccer, field hockey, football and team handball requires cardiovascular endurance. The scores on the cardiovascular portions of health-related fitness tests should be taken into consideration when grouping students. Percentile scores should be used to make classes sex-fair.

Each activity may be grouped by abilities utilizing skill/activity tests. The tests used, however, should not be time consuming. Criteria selected should not be to the disadvantage of girls. As noted earlier, due to the wide range of experiences gained by students (particularly by boys in team sports such as basketball, soccer, football and softball), more girls will appear in lower ability groups until their experience and skill levels improve.

Samples of skill/activity tests

	<u>Skill</u>	<u>Purpose</u>
Volleyball	Overhand throw for distance	To determine serve and spiking potential
	Overhead Pass	Fingertip and hand control
	Height	To determine spiking ability Safety precautions
Softball	Overhand Throw	To determine power of throw and accuracy
		Safety considerations and ability in game play
	Catching Ability from Distant Throws	To determine fear factor and experience
Field Hockey	Height and Weight	Safety during game play
	Dribbling and Passing	To determine stick control and accuracy in passing

The general motor ability tests measure in particular, coordination, reaction time, agility, power and speed. These factors are good determining factors for grouping students in such team sports as basketball, soccer, team handball and field hockey. Both boys and girls could be placed in ability groups based on average scores on all items as follows: upper 33 percent of both boys and girls scores would place these students in the highly skilled group; the middle 33 percent in the medium skilled ability group; and the lower 33 percent placed in the low ability group. Height and weight factors should also be taken into consideration for safety during game play.

B. Individual/Dual Sports

The individual/dual sports considered in this group are archery, badminton, fencing, golf, racquetball and tennis. The writer does not feel the health-related fitness tests for sex-fair ability grouping applies to these sports. However, these activities are appropriate for improving and maintaining health-related fitness.

Skill/activity tests are more widely used for grouping in individual sports. Activities such as archery, golf, and fencing are more suitable to individualized instruction. Ability groups are achieved as levels, such as beginning, intermediate and advanced classes. Placement in these classes is determined by previous learning and performance. These levels are possible to organize providing the classes are not too large. Racquet sports such as badminton, tennis and racquetball could be skill tested as follows: administer several overhead throws for distance to determine overhead throw pattern necessary in tennis and badminton.

Motor ability components are especially reflected in racquet sports and are suitable to sex-fair ability grouping. Coordination, reaction time, agility, power and speed are all necessary motor skills for success in racquet sports.

C. Conditioners

Activities listed under this classification include those related to fitness and body conditioning; namely, swimming, aerobic dance, gymnastics, weight training, cross-country skiing, bicycling, jogging, track and field, rope jumping, and self defense. Results of the health-related fitness test, based on percentile scores of boys and girls, would bring about sex-fair ability grouping in classes. Cardiovascular endurance is a strong factor in group selection in aerobic dance, cross-country skiing, bicycling, jogging, track and field, and rope jumping. Body composition and abdominal and low back-hamstring musculoskeletal function would be needed in gymnastics, aerobic dance and weight training.

Skill testing is particularly functional in establishing ability groups in swimming and gymnastics. The American Red Cross is prominent in ability grouping students by skills achieved in swimming. For physical education instructional classes there is no apparent physiological reason for segregated swimming classes. Levels of progression are well established as students individually achieve through groups by task completion. Gymnastic activities may also be easily ability grouped. Pre-testing such tumbling skills as forward roll, backward roll and handstand would be a good indicator of success in tumbling and gymnastic skills. Skills and routines in both boys and girls gymnastic events would progress by ability levels as in swimming.

"Many activities such as hiking, dancing, swimming, bicycling, walking and calisthenics can be done by people with relatively little skill-related fitness."⁹ Motor ability testing for sex-fair ability grouping is not necessary for these activities since the purpose of the activities is individual improvement. The motor ability test results could be used for ability grouping of students in gymnastics and track and field. Balance, coordination, agility and power are good predictors of successful gymnastic groupings, while coordination, agility, power and speed are good predictors of successful track and field groupings.

D. Rhythms/Dance

In the opinion of the writer, rhythmical and dance activities are not suitable to ability grouping by any of the three skill testing categories. Rather, these activities rely on previous experience gained either outside of class or through physical education programs. In social and square dance classes attempts should be made to maintain an equal number of boys and girls in the classes. Modern dance, jazz dance and other types of rhythmical activities should be encouraged for both sexes as much as possible.

E. Leisure-Time Activities

As explained for the dance category above, it is also true for such offerings as back packing, recreational games, canoeing, sailing, hiking, orienteering, outdoor education, horseback riding, bowling, skating or outward bound activities. No attempts should be made to ability group by testing in these activities, but instead, both sexes should be given equal opportunity to enroll in the activities.

IV. APPLICABILITY OF ABILITY GROUPING METHODS

IN A VARIETY OF EDUCATIONAL SETTINGS

A. Traditional Program Structure

1. Large High School

Many options are available for sex-fair ability grouping of students in large junior or senior high schools. In a daily program of 45-60 minutes of several sections of students, each class period allows for a great deal of flexibility. The author recommends that each student, upon entering junior high or high school and thereafter every year or two, be administered a health-related fitness test and a general motor ability test. The results of these tests should be part of the student's permanent record in physical education. It is recommended for all beginning levels of activities, students be scheduled in ability groups as much as possible. Placement criteria used may be skill/activity test results or motor ability test results. A great deal of testing time can be saved if the results of the motor ability tests are utilized for classification of students.

Scheduling two or more sections of the same grade level (Jr. High grade 7, Sr. High 9th grade and perhaps 10th) in the beginning levels of activities allows instructors to ability group in several ways. With three sections of equal numbers of boys and girls, and three instructors available, students scheduled for volleyball for example, could be given general instruction together and separated by ability groups for practice and game play. Or each instructor after testing could instruct each of their own respective ability groups.

Results of health-related fitness tests and motor ability tests could be used to schedule students for a quarter, semester or entire year in classes of low, middle and advanced abilities. Each ability level of students would have their own separate program of activities for the entire length of time. The program emphasis would meet the learning needs of students and improvement would be paramount.

Most programs are selective at the junior/senior level. Better efforts are needed in large high schools to ability group students fairly at these levels. Also of concern are elective activities offered to both boys and girls; with little or no attempt made to counsel or encourage students to choose activities in such a way that reasonably balanced male/female enrollments would result. Activities at the junior/senior level should be scheduled as a progression of lower ability levels; for example, some junior/senior electives could be intermediate volleyball, advanced volleyball, or combined levels could be organized as intermediate/advanced tennis.

Provisions should be made for students who have not adequately achieved at the beginning levels or freshman/sophomore years. It is recommended however, that repetition of beginning levels of activities not occur in the junior/senior elective program but students of lower ability be encouraged to select activities in the conditioning area for self-improvement. Students of low ability enrolling in intermediate or advanced sections of activities should be challenged to improve their performance. Individualized instruction is encouraged for these students. Accurate records of past performance and test scores are needed to identify students who will need this special learning.

2. Small Junior or Senior High School

In a small school, sex-fair ability grouping may follow the same scheduling pattern as a large high school. The exceptions are the number of electives offered at the junior/senior levels are fewer and more sex-fair ability grouping will occur within the classes. It is recommended that health-related fitness tests and motor ability tests be given at the beginning enrollment year in the program and every year thereafter. The beginning year (7th grade and 9th grade) would be designed for beginning levels of activities and fitness and motor performance improvement. Sections of classes during these years should be scheduled together when possible to better achieve sex-fair ability grouping. Sophomore, junior and senior classes may be combined for a greater choice of electives. The ability levels within these classes will be greater. A planned three-year program of activities to prevent repetition of activities each year, but to create opportunities for ability grouping, would be feasible. To establish the program a two-year phase-in period could occur.

B. Flexible Modular Scheduled School

In flexible modular scheduled schools, sex-fair ability grouping in physical education could occur much the same as described in the traditional scheduled school. The operational assumption of flexible modular scheduled schools is that varied student interests and needs in learning require varied time structures, varied size of classes to facilitate learning activities, and varied teaching methods. Consequently, school schedules utilize small blocks of time called modules (ranging in length from 15 to 25 minutes per module), and a varied number of modules to form large group instruction (60 to 120 students), middle group instruction (25 to 40 students), small group instruction (6 to 15 students) and open laboratory (individuals or partners). All classes would utilize the various learning groups based on the needs of the learners and tasks to be accomplished in the activity. In a study conducted in 1972 by the writer, the majority of schools utilized the middle group

instructional phase in physical education which is basically a traditional physical education class structure. In this same study, principals and physical education teachers of flexible modular scheduled schools felt ability grouping was desirable, but few schools actually had ability grouping operative in their physical education programs.¹⁰

As suggested by Heitmann, beginning students or low ability students would best learn in a small group environment.¹¹ Advanced students, depending on the activity, could learn in middle groups. Methods of selection of students for sex-fair ability grouping in flexible modular programs would be similar to those used in the traditional program. Scheduling ease of activities would best occur if students were grouped by the semester. During a week in a Freshman unit of Volleyball, the following might occur in a flexible modular program. Seventy-five freshmen meet on Monday for a large group session for 30 minutes (2 mods.) to discuss rules and learn by demonstration. The 75 students have been skill tested. Consequently, 30 low ability level students form two small groups for skill development, and 45 students of middle and advanced ability levels form one middle group. The two small groups of low ability level students meet separately twice a week for two 60-minute sessions (4 mods. each) for practice and analysis of skills, and are combined in one middle group for 45 minutes once a week for game play. The small groups are scheduled at the same time to allow flexibility of combining classes if needed. The middle/advanced ability group meets three times a week, 45 minutes each session (3 mods.) in middle groups for skill practice and game play. All students have the availability of the open laboratory in the gymnasium during their unscheduled time for individual help, practice and independent study. Three teachers are available and assigned to the 75 freshmen. The instructors are assigned one to each small group, and one to the middle group. One of the instructors assists the middle group once a week. All instructors are available for open laboratory six modules per day.

C. Variable Time Schedules

Some schools operate on a plan such as a 40-80 plan. Each class meets once a week for 80 minutes and three times a week for 40 minutes. The 80 minutes allow more time for practice and learning of skills and strategies. Time is not lost in preparing for class by students. The 80 minutes would also allow time for ability grouping within the class, individualized instruction and full group game play.

In flexible modular scheduled programs, many schools utilize a six-day cycle instead of a five-day week. The days are numbered 1 to 6 instead of Monday through Friday. After day 6 the cycle repeats itself. By utilizing cycles students do not miss a day for holidays or nonattendance school days. A unit of activity which is normally 4 weeks long but includes two holidays, would, in the cyclic plan miss zero days during a 4-cycle unit. The ending of a unit could occur any day of the week in the cyclic plan. This system has no effect on sex-fair ability grouping except students receive equal numbers of days of instruction in all units of activity.

V. CONCLUDING REMARKS

In reviewing the literature, little discussion and research has been done in the area of sex-fair ability grouping. Most material dealing with coeducational programs recommends ability grouping but little discussion of procedures to follow or examples operative in schools occurs. The writer has ability grouped students within classes in golf, softball, basketball, volleyball, badminton and tennis. The students in the physical education program at Glenbrook South High School, Glenview, Illinois have been ability grouped at the Freshmen level in coeducational swimming, volleyball, and track and field. Two groups were formed with equal numbers of boys and girls in each group. The criteria for grouping was a swimming skill test. The above average group began in volleyball. At the end of 4 1/2 weeks the groups switched. The writer and other staff observed the volleyball classes with curiosity and amazement. Students in the lower skilled ability group in swimming were, in most cases, the lower skilled students in volleyball. The only possible correlating factors between the two groups were the influence of physical fitness and some components of motor ability that may be common between swimming and volleyball. No tests were given however to determine if our observations were valid.

Joan Martin and John Nagle in their 1972 study of Title IX and secondary school physical education programs, noted that many schools are utilizing ability grouping by skill criteria.¹² They made an assumption that many schools were probably using the fitness test or skill tests as used prior to Title IX since the time lapse between Title IX implementation and the study was short.

Whether schools choose to ability group students, teach traditional classes of activities, or utilize individualized instruction, the following instructional methods and techniques are recommended for sex-fair coeducational classes:

1. To continue increasing the opportunities for women as provided for in Title IX, instructors should make concerted efforts to improve the skill and fitness levels of girls in coeducational classes.
2. Physical education departments at the junior and senior high school levels should review closely the goals and objectives of physical education and determine a philosophy for their coeducational program.
3. Regardless of the type of ability grouping used, curriculum and instruction should reflect the goals and objectives of physical education that are fair to both sexes.
4. While equal opportunity in selecting or requiring activities is the law, efforts must be made to improve balancing of boys and girls in coeducational classes. Arnold states, "Whenever one sex predominates in a particular class, the school district should be prepared to explain the sex ratio of the class. Scheduling practices, overt exclusion (unless activity being taught is a contact sport), and coercive counselling are unacceptable explanations for having a predominance of one sex in a class."¹³

5. Any instructional methods used must include the teaching of acceptable and appropriate behaviors and attitudes that are nondiscriminatory. For any coeducational activity to be successful, students must learn to understand and respect each other's strengths and weaknesses as individuals. The learning climate must be void of sex-related biases. The coeducational program should reflect teaching of sex-fair social and emotional goals as well as psychomotor goals.
6. No one method of sex-fair ability grouping will be successful for all activities in the coeducational program. Experimentation with several methods is encouraged.
7. Structured experiences may be needed for boys to experience nontraditional activities such as dance, and for girls to experience more nontraditional aggressive activities such as body contact sports or self-defense tactics.
8. Programs and teachers should always be alert to prudent instruction in coeducational classes for safe learning conditions for students. If ability levels selected reveal performance levels without attention to size, weight or height characteristics of students, instructors could be held liable and negligent.
9. To ensure fair play in the games, instructors should consider the following techniques of classification of students: handicapping system, height, weight or strength classification of students, or tournament flights.
10. While ability grouping is a method of achieving sex-fairness or equality in physical education programs, considerable efforts are needed as well in implementing individualized instructional techniques. Coeducational classes, even when ability grouped, contain diverse student needs and abilities. Individualized instruction will greatly assist student learning when utilized.

DLJ 1327m

FOOTNOTES

1. U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare/Office of Civil Rights, Final Title IX Regulations, p.1, H.E.W. Fact Sheet.
2. Ibid., p. 6.
3. Ibid., p. 24132, Section 56.
4. Ibid., p. 24132, Section 55.
5. Russell Pate and Charles Corbin, "Health-Related Fitness - Implications For Curriculum", JOPHER, pp. 35-38.
6. Greyson Daughtrey, Effective Teaching In Physical Education For Secondary Schools, p. 308.
8. Charles B. Corbin and Ruth Lindsey, "Fitness For Life - Teacher's Edition", p. 129.
9. Ibid., p. 128.
10. Janet Fuller, "The Status of Physical Education Programs In Flexible Modular Scheduled High Schools", M.S. Thesis.
11. Helen Heitmann, "Rationale For Change", Organizational Patterns For Instruction In Physical Education, p. 7.
12. Joan E. Martin and John Nagle, "Impact of Title IX on Secondary School Physical Education Programs in Illinois as Reviewed by Physical Education Department Heads", Illinois Journal, p. 9.
13. Don E. Arnold, "Compliance with Title IX in Secondary School Physical Education", JOPHER, p. 20.

DLJ 1327m

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- AAHPER. Assessment Guide for Secondary School Physical Education Programs. Washington, D.C.: AAHPER Publications, 1977.
- AAHPERD. Health Related Physical Fitness Test Manual. Reston, Virginia: AAHPERD Publications, 1976.
- AAHPER. Ideas for Secondary Physical Education. Washington, D.C.: AAHPER Publications, 1976.
- Corbin, Charles B.; Dowell, Linus J.; Lindsey, Ruth; Tolson, Homer. Concepts In Physical Education - Instructor's Handbook. Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown Company Publishers, 1974.
- Corbin, Charles B. and Lindsey, Ruth. Fitness For Life-Teacher's Edition. Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1979.
- Cowell, Charles C.; Schwehn, Hilda M.; and Walker, June. Modern Methods In Secondary School Physical Education. Boston, Mass.: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1973.
- Daughtrey, Greyson. Effective Teaching In Physical Education For Secondary Schools. Philadelphia, Pa.: W. B. Saunders Co., 1973.
- Heitmann, Helen M. "Rationale For Change." Organizational Patterns for Instruction in Physical Education. Washington, D.C.: AAHPER Publications, 1971.
- Nixon, John E., and Jewett, Ann E. Physical Education Curriculum. New York: The Ronald Press Co., 1964.
- U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare/Office of Civil Rights. Final Title IX Regulation Implementing Education Amendments. Washington, D.C.; 1975.

Periodicals

- "Are You Complying With Title IX In Physical Education?" Physical Education Newsletter. May, 1977.
- Arnold, Don E. "Compliance With Title IX in Secondary School Physical Education." JOPHER. January, 1977, pp. 19-22.
- Boslooper, Thomas. "Physical Assertiveness." JOPHER. May, 1976. pp. 35-37.
- Drowatzky, John N. "Liability You Could Be Sued." JOPHER. May, 1978. pp. 17-18.
- Johnson, Lee. "Co-ed Sports in High School." JOPHER. January, 1977, pp. 23-25.

Kneer, Marian E. and others. "Curriculum Theory Into Practice." JOPHER. March, 1978. pp. 24-37.

Landers, Barb. "Physical Education and Athletics - Title IX's Most Visible Challenge." Physical Education Newsletter. May, 1977.

Lockhart, Barbara. "Title IX - Prospects and Problems." JOPHER. May, 1976. pp. 23-34.

Mancusco, Jo and others. "Quality Secondary School Physical Education." JOPHER. January, 1978, pp. 42-52.

Martin, Joan E., and Nagle, John. "Impact of Title IX on Secondary School Physical Education Programs in Illinois as Reviewed by Physical Education Department Heads." Illinois Journal. Fall, 1979, pp. 9-11.

Melograno, Vincent. "Physical Education Curriculum for the 1980's" JOPHER. September, 1989. pp. 39-54.

Pate, Russell and Corbin, Charles. "Health Related Fitness - Implications For Curriculum." JOPHER. January, 1981. pp. 36-38.

Reams, David and Bleier. "Developing Team Teaching For Ability Grouping." JOPHER. September, 1968. pp. 50-54.

Unpublished Materials

Fuller, Janet M. "The Status of Physical Education Programs In Flexible Modular Scheduled High Schools." Unpublished Master's Thesis. University of Illinois, 1972.

Kneer, Marian E. "Instructional Changes For Cophysical Education Programs." Paper presented at IAHPER Convention. Peoria, 1976.

DLJ 1327m